



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/316,897	05/20/1999	ANAND RAMAKRISHNA	1890	8450

7590 12/19/2003

THE LAW OFFICES OF
AKBERT S MICHALIK
704 228TH AVENUE NE
SUITE 193
REDMOND, WA 98053

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

15

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/316,897

Applicant(s)

RAMAKRISHNA, ANAND

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 10/17/2003 to the original application filed 06/22/1999.
2. Claims 1-47 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 17 and 30 are independent claims.

Request Continuation for Examination

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/17/2003 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-19, and 21-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Poole et al.** (U.S. 6,006,242 – filed 04/1996).

As to independent claim 17, Poole teaches a method of providing dynamic effects to an HTML document (*dynamically constructing electronic and printable documents...World Wide Web page; abstract*), comprising the steps of:

- inserting an element into a document (*a tag is a code that is inserted in a document ... a logical element of the document; col.3, line 62- col.4, line 5/The document components corresponding to the resolved entity references are made available as a stream of resolved entities or components which may be incorporated into a final document; col.6, lines 29-48*); and

- attaching a reference in the document to associate the element with the external component (*Each of the constituent portions of the document is associated with an entity reference; col.5, lines 1-14 & Abstract/The document developer selects one or more entity references to develop a document instance ... each of the entity references associated with the document instance are resolved associates entity references with the document instance; col.6, lines 49-63*); and providing the document to a renderer (*fig. 3*).

Poole does not explicitly teach “encapsulating code in an external component for affecting the behavior of elements, including elements of different documents.”

However, Poole suggests “*knowledge is entered into the Knowledge Base in the form of documents, document components, document type definitions, catalogs, rules, links, and other information needed to construct any number of document and form types. The constituent information contained in the Knowledge Base may include entire documents, portions of*

Art Unit: 2176

documents, phrases, sentences, words, and characters, including non-alphanumeric characters ...the knowledge is entered into the Knowledge Base in units of text or text fragments referred to herein as components; col.6, lines 15-48 and figs. 3-4).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of Poole for “encapsulating code in an external component for affecting the behavior of elements, including elements of different documents” because it would have provided the enhanced capability for customizing dynamic content in the generated HTML documents.

As to dependent claim 18, Poole teaches providing the external component to the renderer (*fig. 3*).

As to dependent claim 19, Poole teaches rendering a page image from the document, accessing the external component, and modifying a representation of the element based on the code in the external component (*col.12, lines25-45*).

As to dependent claim 21, Poole teaches modifying a presentation of the element includes the changing the appearance thereof (*col.9, lines 50-64*).

As to dependent claim 22, Poole teaches modifying a presentation of the element includes the changing the location thereof (*col.9, lines 50-64*).

As to dependent claim 23, Poole teaches rendering a page image from the document, accessing the external component, and drawing information in the image based on the code in the external component (*col.12, lines25-45*).

As to dependent claim 24, Poole teaches rendering a page image from the document is interleaved with drawing information in the image (*col.69, lines 32-41 and col.70, lines 3-23*).

As to dependent claim 25, Poole teaches receiving an event indicative of user interaction with the image (*col. 70, lines 3-23*).

As to dependent claim 26, Poole teaches the reference associating the element with the external component is maintained in a cascading stylesheet (*col. 10, line 66-col. 11, line 8*).

As to dependent claim 27, Poole teaches the information associating the element with the external component is maintained in a custom tag (*col. 10, lines 44-65*).

As to dependent claim 28, Poole teaches the information associating the element with the external component is maintained in a class identifier (*abstract*).

As to dependent claim 29, Poole teaches the reference associating the element with the external component is maintained inline with the element in the document (*col. 6, lines 49-63*).

As to independent claim 1, the rejection of claim 17 above is incorporated herein in full. Claim 1, however, further recites “rendering a page image corresponding to at least part of the document, the page image including a representation of the element; and accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the element rendered on the page image.”

Poole teaches rendering a page image corresponding to at least part of the document, the page image including a representation of the element; and accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the element rendered on the page image (*col. 65, line 50-col. 66, line 15*).

As to dependent claim 2, Poole teaches receiving an event, and wherein accessing the external component is performed in response to the event (*col. 70, lines 3-23*).

Dependent claims 3-5 include the same limitations as in claims 21-23, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 6, Poole teaches the external component comprises an object, and wherein accessing the external component includes instantiating an instance of the object (*col.6, lines 15-48*).

As to dependent claim 7, Poole teaches receiving a new document having another element thereon, the new document including information associating the other element with the external component, rendering a new page image corresponding to at least part of the document, the new page image including a representation of the other element, and accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the other element rendered on the page image (*col.65, line 50-col.66, line 15*).

Dependent claims 9-12 include the same limitations as in claims 26-29, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 13, Poole teaches the document includes another element having a representation thereof rendered in the page image, the document includes other information associating the other element with the external component, and further comprising, accessing the external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the other element (*col.65, line 50-col.66, line 15*).

As to dependent claim 14, Poole teaches the document includes information associating the element with a second external component, and further comprising, accessing the second external component for determining a behavior of the representation of the element (*col.5, lines 14-39*).

As to dependent claim 15, Poole teaches resolving a conflict between the behavior determined by the external component and the behavior determined by the second external component (*col.6, lines 28-63*).

As to dependent claim 16, Poole teaches downloading the external component (*col.12, lines 11-45*).

Independent claim 30 includes the same limitations as in claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Claim 30, however, further recite “an external component encapsulating code for modifying the behavior of elements, including elements of different documents”

As to an external component encapsulating code for modifying the behavior of elements, including elements of different documents, refer to discussion of claim 17 above for rejection.

Dependent claim 31 includes the same limitations as in claim 25, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 32, Poole teaches the renderer displays a representation of the element and modifies a behavior of the element by accessing the external component (*col.46, lines 47-67*).

Dependent claims 33-35 include the same limitations as in claims 21-23, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 36, Poole teaches the renderer calls the external component a plurality of times to draw information on the page image, and the renderer draws information on the page image between at least some of calls to the external component (*col.69, lines 32-41 and col.70, lines 3-23*).

As to dependent claim 37, Poole teaches the external component comprises an object, and wherein the rendered instantiates an instance of the object (*col.6, lines 14-48*).

As to dependent claim 38, Poole teaches the external component comprises an object, and wherein the rendered communicates with the object (*col.6, lines 14-48*).

As to dependent claim 39, Poole teaches the render receives a new document having another element thereon that references the external component (*col.6, lines 14-48*).

Dependent claim 40 includes the same limitations as in claim 9, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Dependent claim 41 includes the same limitations as in claim 26, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale

Dependent claim 43 includes the same limitations as in claim 27, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Dependent claims 44-46 include the same limitations as in claims 12-14, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 47, Poole teaches the renderer accesses the external component to control the format of data input by a user (*col.63, lines 20-42*).

5. Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Poole et al.** in view of **Courts et al.** (U.S. 6,085,220).

As to dependent claim 20, Poole does not explicitly teach “a COM object.”

Courts teaches a COM object (*COM objects; fig. 1*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Courts with Poole because it would have provided the enhanced capability for customizing dynamic content in the generated HTML documents.

Dependent claim 8 includes the same limitations as in claim 20, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) rejection.

Responsive to arguments set forth in Applicant's declaration (paper # 14), the Examiner has considered and removed Shigemi reference used in the previous office action.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Johnson, II et al. U.S Patent No. 6397245 issued dated: May 28, 2002

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-5403 for regular communications and (703) 308-5403 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Contact Information:

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746-7238.

OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 872-9306.

NON OFFICIAL faxes should be sent to (703) 746-7240.

All OFFICIAL faxes will be handled and entered by the docketing personnel. The date of entry will correspond to the actual FAX reception date unless that date is a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal Holiday within the District of Columbia, in which case the official date of receipt will be the next business day. The application file will be promptly forwarded to the Examiner unless the application file must be sent to another area of the Office, e.g., Finance Division for fee charging, etc.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist). All hand-delivered responses will be handled and entered by the docketing personnel. Please do not hand deliver responses directly to the Examiner.

Maikhanh Nguyen
December 15, 2003


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER